

14

THE OLD PATHS.

A LETTER TO A COUNTRY CONGREGATION FROM A MISSIONARY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH, MATILDA.

Brockville, April 6, 1843.

Dearly Beloved Brethren,

At the request of one highly esteemed, by you and by me, for his work's sake and his own sake,—your minister,—I address you on a subject which, on other grounds, could make no claim to special notice. I allude to a letter handed to me immediately after a funeral at Matilda, and written by a teacher of one of the subdivisions of one of those unhappy schisms which are weakening the influences of true religion, wasting the energies of Protestantism, bringing contempt on our holy faith, furnishing plausible arguments to the grand schism of schisms—Popery,—countenancing the sophistries of infidelity, and thus (albeit unintentionally, but still most surely and effectually) doing the will of the adversary.

The letter was directed to the "Rev. E. Denroche, Matilda," and runs thus :

"Matilda, March 13, 1843.

"Rev. and Dear Sir,

"The regular successors of the apostles are holding a protracted meeting in this vicinity, where souls are being converted to God. There is a prayer meeting at the house of George Brouse, Esq., this day, at two o'clock, P. M., to which meeting you are by this note cordially invited to attend to, for the purpose of getting your soul converted to God, if you had experienced that change, I have no doubt you would make an able minister of the New Testament, and become one of the regular successors in fact.

"I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir,

"Your's affectionately,

"DANIEL BERNEY, W. M. M."

Had I not most reasonable grounds to fear that the "note" of this total stranger was neither *sincere in its nature* nor *kind in its intention*, I should have replied to it. But being convinced, from its internal evidence and from incidental circumstances, that the spirit which dictated it was not prepared to be benefited in the smallest degree by such a reply as I must have returned, I determined to take no notice of the matter;—in short, to "answer him not."

Whether the inferences leading to this determination were fairly and fully deducible, you, brethren, may soon judge.

Those of you who were present on that solemn occasion are aware, that a number of the teachers and other maintainers of Methodism entered our Church, and with eye and ear witnessed me earnestly and deliberately exhorting you to eschew the sin of schism, as hateful to God, contrary to Christ's will, forbidden of His Spirit, injurious to the truth, and detrimental to charity. These persons must have heard me affectionately and solemnly warning you *to the effect* that you should not suffer the seed of Satan—of him whose motto is, "Divide and conquer,"—to be sown among you. They must have heard it enjoined upon you, as faithful members of Christ, answerable to God for the souls of your children, to give no countenance whatever, by example or otherwise, to the practice of this or any other "abominable thing which God hateth"—"not to give heed to seducing spirits" and unscriptural doctrines—not to listen to "the voice of strangers," nor to "heap to yourselves teachers having itching ears;" but to "abide faithful" to your vows, faithful to your Saviour, as living members of His own Body the Church—as sound in doctrine, pure in practice, "renewed in the spirit of your minds from day to day," and "growing up into Him in all things which is the Head." They must have heard you seasonably though not ably cautioned never to

mistake a ready tongue (that flippancy in talking about high and holy things so much in repute among Dissenters) for evidence of real godliness—for "the witness of the Spirit," or the test of truth—to preach Christ in your conduct and conversation—to shew forth the gospel not only with your lips, but also in your lives—to pray TOGETHER and to read God's word TOGETHER—as opportunity offered, to receive at the hands of your God-commissioned minister the divinely-appointed memorials of the Lord's love—to bring your infant children into the covenant of grace, through a baptism and ministry, both of divine appointment—to recollect that the DISPENSATION of sacraments, the holy mysteries of the faith, was not committed to *all* Christian men, women and children, but to persons in the first instance specially chosen of Christ, and afterwards to those by them specially set apart to "minister in holy things," who, again appointing others, were thus to preserve valid ordinances through a valid ministry—to be assured that, how plausible soever the pretensions of any assuming to themselves the title of ministers of the Church of CHRIST, yet if they could neither prove their commission from HIM, either by *succession* (as belonging to the apostolic ministry), or by *miracle* (as belonging to some newer sort of ministry authorised of God), they act without warrant and on mere presumption—they "run without being sent," and cannot prove that their rites are valid sacraments. These same persons heard me enjoining you, while you carefully avoided those who oppose themselves to the Church and to the doctrines thereof—the doctrines maintained and defended by the Reformers and that holy army of martyrs who laid down their lives for truth's sake—to entertain feelings of charity towards the errorists themselves, and to manifest those feelings in acts of personal kindness towards them whenever it lay in your power so to do. They heard me beseeching you to "be

steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord"—"steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread and in the prayers"—steadfast in being "holy in all manner of conversation"—steadfast in "walking worthy of the high vocation wherewith ye were called," and, while steadfast in "marking them that caused divisions and in avoiding them," to "do good unto all men."

Now, it seems to me *morally impossible* that any one of common understanding, after listening to these, or such like remarks, could REALLY BELIEVE IN HIS HEART that the person who uttered them would himself, in the next moment, be induced to commit the crime against which he had most particularly and strenuously raised his voice, and to plunge headlong into the hottest flames of fanaticism—not for the purpose of "plucking" some "as brands from the burning"—not for the purpose of "converting" poor deluded souls from "the error of their way"—not for the purpose of testifying a real heartfelt love for the souls of the Methodists by exposing to them the true nature, working and tendency of the delusive system which leads them captive—the thorough monstrousness of modern Methodism, to wit, its almost entire opposition to *that* Methodism commenced by Church of England Clergymen a hundred years ago, (by men whose boast it was to have lived and to die within her pale)—its undisguised or ill-disguised hostility to that Church, its carnal character, its multiplied divisions, its Popery, its lying miracles, miraculous conversions, visions and dreams; its system of a confession, compulsory on pain of excommunication; its proselytism, promoted by means the end could never sanctify; its Jesuitism, its deceptions, traps and claptraps, class, camp, prayer, protracted and revival meetings; its midnight orgies, with all the accompanying evil and "appearance of evil;" its conse-

quent neglect of household duties, and even of the godly obedience due to the monitions of parents or husbands; its phariseism, spiritual pride and censoriousness; its exclusively arrogating to itself the character of being the perfection of purity, the quintessence of sanctification, yea, as on earth, pre-eminently the holy of holies; its dependence (for extension) upon nervous and animal excitements; its Socinian and Arian tendencies; its palpable persecution of those who forsake the error; its bigotry, strife, envyings, slanders, divisions, subdivisions: in a word, "the shame of its nakedness;" No, not for any one of these purposes, nor yet for the purpose of "trying them who say they are apostles and are not," no—but "for the purpose of being converted"—converted into a Methodist teacher! As surely as Mr. Daniel Berney, W. M. M., and those privy to the getting up of the "note," are satisfied of their own existence, and convinced that they have heads on their shoulders, so surely *must* they have been MORALLY CERTAIN that there was not the shadow of a probability that he to whom it was addressed could be swayed thereby to run after its run-away writer to any of their meetings for any such wicked purpose—to run after a person who either did not think it prudent, or not worth his while, to "bide a wee" and "speak face to face" the matter of his note. He must have known that a few minutes would have left me at leisure to hear any such remarks as he might have thought proper to make.

I could not conceive that Mr. Berney's note was in reality an honest and kind one. Its want of sincerity and good feeling—its invitation given when he must have well known that it could not be accepted, and its random censoriousness, based on some supposed gift of "discerning of spirits," compelled me to consider its author's conduct as a *gratuitus bravado intended to annoy*; while at the same time I ascribed

the proceeding to Methodism in its natural working, rather than to the man himself—considering it a sin of *the system* rather than of the individual. Impressed with these convictions, I left the “note” unreplied to; and now only notice it thus much for your satisfaction and at the request of your minister. If Mr. Berney and his friends regard his proceeding as a clever thing and a good joke, let us leave them in undisturbed enjoyment of a pleasantry that savours much more of the malevolent spirit of modern Methodism than of Christian conversion. We need not envy them their feelings, nor doubt whether persons of sound judgment and sound religion will be at any loss to estimate it just as it deserves. If, again, Mr. Berney and his brother Wesleyan Methodist Ministers consider his conduct as a *sort of retaliation*, (deeming his “affectionate” thrust a fair hit at one in whose mission two teachers of Methodism were not long since convinced of error and converted from it), I can heartily forgive him and them, and pray that they, and others, may yet be convinced of the culpability of their present position, and of the folly of those, who **BLINDLY DETERMINE NOT TO BE CONVINCED**, but to be to the last the advocates of party,—the partizans of systematic division,—the unrelenting opposers of a Church, Protestant against all error, Catholic in doctrine, and Apostolic in descent. But they may rest assured that, with the blessing of Him who said to His Apostles, “Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” the humblest contributor to the furtherance of the cause of conversion—not Methodist conversion—but conversion to “Christ and the Church,”—will take willingly, yea, joyfully, if they *must* come, the sneers of those who retain the name of *Wesleyan* while their every principle almost, varies from the principles of the two *Wesleys*—while they set aside their founder’s most awful warnings, and laugh at his **SERMON** expressly levelled **AGAINST SCHISM**—that sin, which is a

tower of strength to the Papacy, and a sheet anchor to Infidelity. As long as the eyes of men are opened to this simple and undeniable fact—that at a time when the Church, even on the testimony of her enemies, was *far less* efficient than she has been for the last quarter of a century, Wesleyan Methodism proclaimed itself the most consistent, most devoted, and most attached portion of that Church (the united Church of England and Ireland): but that now, Methodism ranges itself with her bitterest enemies—with papists, heretics, and infidels—denies that her members, clergy or laity, are converted,—sets up an opposition altar and a hostile ministry—the members of which, controlled by a system of Protestant Jesuitism, are compelled, by the supposed necessity of building up their would-be-Church, to “compass sea and land” to proselyte to their connexion: As long as men’s eyes are being opened to the fact that these teachers do not scruple to malign the ministers of the Church, and thereby undermine their proper influence,—do not scruple to build themselves up on the ruin they themselves have made, that they may, after “creeping into houses,” lead aside silly, unstable, and unsuspecting souls: as long as men are opening their eyes to the iniquity of a system, which depraves its ministers, blunts their better feelings, and drives them into the continual commission of pious frauds: as long as men are rubbing the scales from their eyes—are being convinced of the melancholy truth that MODERN METHODISM is essentially defective in honour, honesty, charity, and such like indispensable ingredients of true religion; and are consequently seeking out “THE OLD PATHS,” and praying that their feet may be guided “into the way of peace,”—so long, will the faithful children of the Church help them on their way to Zion, and rejoice in seeing them become fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of faith.

we should have looked upon it as a prophetic warning

I shall not comment at any length on Mr. Berney's judgment declaratory of my presumed unconverted state—a judgment evincing more haste than charity, considering that he has never been acquainted with me. "It is a little thing to be judged of him or of man's judgment." Would that they who fancy themselves possessed of the discerning of spirits, were converted to an obedience of Christ's command: "Judge not and ye shall not be judged," a text seemingly in little repute with the admirers of *Methodism as it is*. If *Methodist* conversion was *Christian* conversion, there would be more of the spirit of that text evidenced in the converted; more of the "hopeth all things;" nor would the world witness so frequently the awful falls of many boasted "converts" to the soul-deluding system.

I am not without some doubts that, were THE WESLEYS now living, Mr. Berney and other Wesleyan Methodist Ministers would dispute their conversion; for both JOHN and CHARLES were *strenuously opposed to schism*, and to the impiety of "setting up" preachers of Methodism as ministers of God's sanctuary. In a sermon preached by John, at Cork, in Ireland, a couple of years only before his death, he used these words: "In 1744, all the Methodist preachers had their first conference; but none of them dreamed that the being called to preach gave them any right to administer the sacraments. And when the question was proposed, 'In what light are we to consider ourselves?' it was answered, 'As extraordinary messengers, raised up to provoke the ordinary ones to jealousy!' In order hereto, one of our first rules was given to each preacher: 'You are to do that part of the work which we appoint.' But what work was this? Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments, to exercise the priestly office? Such a design *never entered into our minds; it was the farthest from our thoughts*. And if any preacher had taken such a step, we should have looked upon it as a palpable breach

of this rule and consequently as a *recantation of our connexion*; for, suppose (what I utterly deny) that the receiving you as a preacher at the same time gave an authority to administer the sacraments, yet it gave you no other authority than to do it or any thing else where I appoint. But where did I appoint you to do this? No where at all. Therefore by this very rule you are excluded from doing it; and doing it you renounce the first principle of Methodism. Now as long as the Methodists keep to this plan they CANNOT *separate from the Church*.

* * * I believe one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long, is, to confirm them in their present purpose NOT to *separate from the Church*. I wish all of you, who are vulgarly called Methodists, would seriously consider what has been said; and particularly you whom God has commissioned to call sinners to repentance; it does by no means follow from hence that you are commissioned to baptize or administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this till ten or twenty years after ye began to preach. Ye did not then, *like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, SEEK THE PRIESTHOOD ALSO*. O! contain yourselves within your own bounds; be content with preaching the gospel. * * * Ye yourselves were first called in the Church of England; and though ye have, and will have a thousand temptations to leave it, and SET UP *for yourselves*, regard them not; BE CHURCH-OF-ENGLAND-MEN STILL; do not cast away the peculiar glory which God has put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God raised you up."* Such were the words,

* The above extracts are taken from a sermon preached by the Rev. John Wesley, at Cork, in Ireland, about two years before his death; and are to be found in his Works, vol. vii. London, 1831. Mr. Wesley, writing afterwards to the Editor of the *Dublin Chronicle*, somewhat over a year before his death, thus strongly and solemnly recorded his impressions. "Unless

the almost dying advice of John Wesley to his Irish followers. Mr. Berney is an Irishman, I have heard.

Let us now see what were the wishes of Charles Wesley, John's brother and associate. The following is extracted from a letter of his to an American clergyman: "I never lost my dread of a separation, or ceased to guard our societies against it. I frequently told them, I am your servant, as long as you remain members of the Church of England; but no longer. *Should you ever forsake her, you renounce me.* Some of our lay preachers very early discovered an inclination to separate, which induced my brother to publish reasons against a separation. As often as it appeared, we beat down the SCHISMATICAL spirit. If any one did leave **THE CHURCH**, at the same time he left our Society. For fifty years we kept the sheep in **THE FOLD**, and having fulfilled the number of our days only waited to depart in peace."†

I see more reason for it than ever I yet saw, I WILL NOT LEAVE the Church of England as by law established WHILE THE BREATH OF GOD IS IN MY NOSTRILS." (See Jackson's "*Church and the Methodists*," page 26. Jackson was himself a Methodist.) The following expressions are to be found, scattered through the writings of John Wesley:—"When we forsake the Church, God will forsake us."—"They that are enemies to the Church, are enemies to me."—"I will rather lose twenty Societies than separate from the Church."—"You cannot be too watchful against evil speaking, or too zealous for the poor Church of England."—"I live and die a member of the Church of England, and none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it."—"I DARE not separate from the Church; I BELIEVE it would be sin so to do."—How strange is it that men will not only adopt the name of a poor fellow creature, whereby to designate their religious creed, but will select or retain the name of one, whose words and writings are so thoroughly opposed to the sin of separation—to the sinful schism of those who call themselves "WESLEYANS!" while they are, "in fact" "ANTI-WESLEYS."

† See "*Sermons on the Ministry, Worship, and Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church*," by G. T. Chapman, printed at Burlington, U. S. 1832. The seventh sermon contains these remarks of the Rev. Charles Wesley, with others;

The poor Wealeys, were they now on earth, would undoubtedly, in the opinion of Mr. Berney, need to attend some of his prayer meetings "*for the purpose of getting their souls converted to God.*"

Mr. Berney unequivocally asserts that the teachers of modern Methodism are "the regular successors of the apostles." "The regular successors of the apostles are holding," says his note, "a protracted meeting in this vicinity." The Methodist teachers were holding the meeting alluded to, and none others, therefore *they* are the persons described as "the regular successors of the apostles. Therefore also, where the writer of the note says, that, if I was converted, *he doubts not I would become one of the regular successors in fact.*" he of course means—a *Methodist teacher in fact.* After this, he surely need not wonder if we glance at the pretensions of the Wesleyan Methodist ministers to be considered "the regular successors of the apostles" "*in fact.*" So, now for facts.

Regular successors of the apostles are they who have received regular unequivocal authority in the Church of God, the one body of Christ, to ordain

as also a statement of Dr. Coke's application to Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the purposes of a union of the Methodists with the Church—a *valid* consecration of himself to the Episcopate, or Apostolate—and a *valid* ordination of those, on whom he had presumptuously laid his unauthorised, uncommissioned, hands. The Rev. Dr. Chapman does not seem to have recollected, when adverting to Coke's consciousness of his not being a true bishop, but merely a Methodist "superintendent," that he afterwards applied in writing, to Lord Liverpool, to have him consecrated as a Bishop for India; saying that, if the Prince Regent and the government would consent, he "would return most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the Established Church, and submit to all such restrictions in the fulfilment of his office as the government and the bench of Bishops at home should think necessary." Such is the source of Methodist ordinations, or rather superintendencies.

certain men to minister in holy things; and also, to convey the same special trust and commission of ordaining to persons consecrated by them for that very purpose. The power of ordaining presbyters and deacons was not conveyed to all ministers, but was entrusted to select persons. Thus, for instance, St. Paul did not charge the *Elders*, or presbyters, of *Ephesus*, to "lay hands suddenly on no man," not to receive an accusation against an elder but before a competent number of witnesses; but he charged their superior, by *whatever* title he may be called—he charged Timothy, the Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus, Bishop of Crete, to *ordain elders and deacons*. The *POWER* of ordaining was *limited* to that superior order of ministers to which Timothy and Titus belonged: an order not known in the Church by the title of Bishop, but known, during the lives of those whom we strictly call the apostles, by the title of *Apostle*—a title applied by *St. Paul himself* to *Timothy, Titus, Silvanus*, and others. Now, the *FACT* is, that the same *power* of calling to the ministry, a power conveyed by the first apostles *exclusively* to Titus, Timothy, and certain others (whether we call these apostles, successors of the apostles, angels of the churches, or bishops)—did *THEY* in the same manner convey *exclusively* to certain others. Presbyters, though members of an apostolic ministry, were, according to the testimony of all antiquity, without any commission to ordain. They were not the "successors of the apostles," though eligible to be raised to that burdensome dignity; nor were they invested with the peculiar powers of the apostolate. This system is properly *Divine*, for it was developed by men inspired by the Spirit of God,—by our Lord's apostles. It has been followed in the Church without any interruption for full fifteen centuries; is continued down to the present time; and will continue always, even unto the end of the world. The advo-

cates of Presbyterianism—that is, of the conceit that *presbyters* may have an *official right to ordain without the intervention of a bishop*—have been repeatedly challenged, and all without effect, to produce if they can ONE well authenticated instance of *such* ordination in the Church, during the first fifteen centuries, being regarded as a valid and true ordination. It is a FACT also that there is no historic evidence of any presbyter broaching so wild an idea *prior to THE HERETIC AERIU*, a SEMI-ARIAN, who, aspiring after being made a bishop, was disappointed in his scheme of ambition, and was cast out of the Church for his heretical views, both as to doctrine and discipline. It is also a FACT, notorious and indubitable, that NO BISHOP, or, to use Mr. Berney's words, no "*regular successor of the apostles*" has ever yet conveyed to a Methodist, whether presbyter, or preacher, or teacher, the sacred commission and power to ordain; and consequently that the Methodist regular succession is NOT an "*apostolic succession*," and Methodist teachers, and Wesleyan Methodist ministers, are NOT "*the regular successors of the apostles in FACT*," however they may be so *in fancy*. Thus we see that the emphatic assertion of Mr. Berney is contradicted by *facts* that furnish evidence, incontrovertible and conclusive, against them "*who say they are apostles and are not*" in fact. There is another FACT which is in itself a plain proof that one of the grand apostles of Methodism, Dr. Thomas Coke, a man who would fain have persuaded himself and others, that John Wesley had consecrated him to the episcopate, WAS NOT A BELIEVER (after all his efforts to persuade himself into the delusion) IN THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDERS HE HIMSELF CONFERRED. He did NOT believe that he had that "*regular succession*" which would empower him to ordain as a bishop; and though really a presbyter, he could not swallow the presbyterian notion. He therefore applied to Bishop

White, of the United States, to re-ordain his ministers, to give himself a valid consecration, and to receive the Methodists into the Church. John Wesley had previously said, "How dare you be called a bishop. Let the *Presbyterians* do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better."

But, mayhap, Mr. Berney is claiming some sort of invisible succession, as some men find it convenient to talk of an *invisible* church upon earth; and would reckon anything else a "*popish* figment." He may not be aware of another FACT, to wit—that the *Papacy has done every thing in its power to overthrow Episcopal influence within its own borders*; and that the various orders of friars, and the society of Ignatius Loyola, were fostered by the popes on account of their inevitable tendency *practically* to PRESBYTERIANIZE the Roman Church. He may not be aware that popes *discountenance the doctrine of the DIVINE RIGHT of bishops*; a FACT plainly proved by the following extract from "Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent," as translated by Nathaniel Brent, in 1620:—"The twelfth of March the pope made a promotion of nineteen cardinals, for reward of the great service they did him in counsel, in which he resolved NOT to comprehend *any* of those who held the RESIDENCE AND INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS TO BE *de jure divino* (of Divine right), HOWSOEVER THEIR QUALITIES MIGHT OTHERWISE DESERVE THE DEGREE; and did not forbear to discover so much to all sorts of persons upon every occasion."*

* "They take their aim much amiss who look upon Episcopacy as a branch of *Popery*, or a device of the Bishop of Rome to advance his own greatness. Whereas the contrary is *most certain*, that the Pope is the greatest impugner of Bishops, and the Papacy itself sprung from the unjust usurpation of their just rights. Let it be once admitted that *Bishops are by divine right*, and instantly all his dispensations, and reservations, and exemptions, and indulgences, and his conclave of Cardinals, and the whole Court of Rome, *shrink to nothing*."

O! that they who deceive themselves into the fond imagination that they are in any sense "regular successors of the apostles," of Him who earnestly PRAYED that they who should believe in Him *might be one*—successors of those who enjoined Christians to be *of one mind*, to "speak the *same thing*;" to "mark them that caused divisions, and to avoid them;" to be "ONE body," with members moving harmoniously together; to see that *there be "no schism in the body*;" to be as "a building fitly framed together;" O! that they would look upon the divisions which are continually splitting up their own societies, and separating them into opposition communions—biting and abusing, devouring and defaming one another; that they would consider *where all this is to end?* whether it be not plainly and palpably the *very opposite* state of things to that for which our blessed Saviour PRAYED? yea, of all others, THE VERY STATE OF

This was clearly perceived by both parties in the *ventilation of that famous question in the Council of Trent concerning the divine right of Bishops*, proposed by the Almain, Polonians, and Hungarians, seconded bravely by the Spaniards, prosecuted home by the French, owned by the Archbishop of Paris as the doctrine of the Sorbonne, and only crossed by the *Italian* faction to preserve the glory of their own country, and the advantages which that nation doth reap from the Papacy; by whose frowardness and prevarication (in all probability) the re-union of the Church, and the universal peace of this part of Christendom in necessary truths, was hindered at that time."—*Archbishop Bramhall*.

"The Scripture hath enjoined and empowered all Bishops to feed, guide, and rule their respective Churches, *as the ministers, stewards, ambassadors, angels of God*; 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ:'" to whom God hath committed the care of their people, so that they are responsible for their souls. All which rights and privileges of the Episcopal office the Pope hath invaded, doth obstruct, cramp, frustrate, destroy; pretending, without any warrant, that *their authority is derived from him*; forcing them to exercise it in no otherwise than as his subjects and according to his pleasure."—*Dr. Isaac Barrow*.

See *The Church*, Vol. vi. p. 177.

THINGS IN WHICH SATAN DELIGHTS? whether the spread of gospel truth is not most lamentably impeded by the divisions of its professors? whether the most zealous maintainers of the Tridentine schism—of Popery and its worst corruptions; whether the bitterest abettors of infidel blasphemy would not be disappointed and cut to the heart, if they had to witness ONE NOBLE SPECTACLE—the REGENERATION OF DISSENTING PROTESTANTISM; if they had to behold all Protestant Dissenters, laying aside their private interpretations, various views, and separate interests, returning to a hearty profession of the Catholic creeds, the bulwarks of Protestantism, and again grafted in as goodly scions into the branches of God's own vine, the CHURCH—that visible, universal, and Protestant Church which the pope endeavoured to destroy by the instrumentality of his Jesuit-friars? A FACT indeed. They preached as PURITANS in Puritan pulpits through England, reviling the Prayer-Book as “*the English Mass-Book*,” and teaching the people to pray “*spiritually and extempore*.” One of them, Cummin, a friar, stated in Council that “this hath so taken with the people that the Church of England is become *as odious* to that sort of people whom I instructed, (the Puritans) *as the mass is to the Church of England*, and this will be a stumbling-block to that Church as long as it is a Church.”

The pope rewarded this individual for his good services with two thousand ducats. Alas! in these days he need not pay Papists to malign the Church of England, when Protestants-in-name are ready to revile her without fee or reward, and yet, God knoweth, they may “have their reward.”

Again, it would be well for those Protestant Dissenters, whose thoughts are everywhere turned to unscriptural schemes of Christian union, to ask themselves honestly whether the enemies of true religion are not *well pleased* to see the opposing Protestant

sects wasting their energies in pursuing the hollow humbug of a union based on the rotten expedient of a temporary sinking of their differences, in running after an *ignis-fatuus*, which will leave them at last in deeper darkness, in grasping at a shadow when they might have laid hold on and secured the substance? Most assuredly that course which the powers of darkness, and of Popery, and of blasphemy, must regard as *strengthening* their odious interests, is not, *cannot* be the proper one for those who have the love of God at heart to pursue. Would to God that Protestant Dissenters would ask themselves these questions, and answer them honestly to their consciences in the sight of God; that they would "consider their ways;" for THEN would the sober-minded among them rise superior to petty interests and party feelings, return both to the doctrine and communion of the apostles, eat of the ONE BREAD, and drink of the ONE CUP; they would flee to the refuge of God's own appointment, the ark of his Church; they would return "as doves to their windows," bearing with them the tokens of peace—indications of the truth that the happy hour must come, when the angry waters of strife that now foam out their own shame shall subside; the visible ark, provided by the wisdom and goodness of God, be no longer necessary; and the Church militant here on earth be absorbed into the Church triumphant in heaven.

They who presume to say that the hearts of true Churchmen do not yearn after the souls of Dissenters, both Popish and Protestant, KNOW NOTHING OF TRUE CHURCHMEN,—understand "neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." There is not one deserving the name who would not joyfully lay down his life if by so doing he might reclaim schismatics to the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, to the obedience of Christ; and thus be instrumental in repairing the breaches of Zion, and building up the

walls of Jerusalem. The true Churchman, though conscious that his testimony against error will necessarily bear traces of the infirmities that encompass him, will yet UNHESITATINGLY AND HONESTLY bear witness against the evil. He desires to draw a broad distinction between *the error* he is bound to hate, and the *errorist* whom he is equally bound to love. He feels that when the Word of Him, who is love, enjoins him to "mark them that cause divisions and to avoid them," it is most certain that such avoidance is really an act of godly charity, and a God-prescribed testimony against sin, against the strength of Satan, against that abominable thing whereon God hath set the broad brand of condemnation,—DIVISION—SCHISM.

Praying that He may keep you steadfast and immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; and that all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life,

I have the privilege of subscribing myself,

Dear Brethren,

Your Servant for Christ's sake,

E. DENROCHE.